Reply to Office Action Mailed: January 30, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 010408.52444US

**REMARKS** 

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing

to comply with the written description requirement. In response to this ground

of rejection, Claim 1, and the dependent claims which depend thereon, have been

amended to change the terminology "metallic strip" to "metal strip".

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is

respectfully requested.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. In response to

this ground of rejection, Applicants have amended Claim 12 to recite that the

"metal strip" comprises certain identified materials. Accordingly, it is no longer

possible to read Claim 1 in such a manner that the metal strip and the connector

material are two separate and independent elements of the solar cell, as stated

on page 4 of the Office Action. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of this

ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

Under the heading "Response to Amendment", starting at page 6 of the

Office Action, Claims 1, 12, 14, 16, 17, 31 and 32 have been rejected under 35

U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description

requirement, based on the proposition that the specification does not reasonably

Page 5 of 9

Amendment Dated: June 30, 2008

Reply to Office Action Mailed: January 30, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 010408.52444US

convey to a person skilled in the art that the "marginal area" is round, oval or

polygonal. In response to this ground of rejection, Applicants have amended

Claim 1 to recite that "the compensation section and the central opening are one

of round, oval and polygonal". Support for this amendment is found in the

specification at paragraph [0023], in the carryover sentence on pages 6 and 7,

which states that "the compensation section 2 has a framed shaped structure 5,

and has the shape of an oval". In addition, paragraph [0024], which refers to "a

circular compensation section 2" while the first sentence of paragraph [0025]

refers to an "angular compensation section 2". Moreover, the respective oval,

circular and polygonal compensation sections 2 are clearly illustrated in Figures

1, 3, 4 and 5. A person skilled in the art would understand, based on these

materials, that the compensation section in the solar connector according to the

invention may have a shape which is circular, oval or polygonal. Accordingly,

reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully

requested.

In response to the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second

paragraph, as set forth at pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, Applicants have

amended Claim 16 to delete the words "of the connector". Accordingly, Claim 16

now recites that "the conductive material" comprises one a select group of

materials. The phrase "the conductive material" has an antecedent in the third

Page 6 of 9

Amendment Dated: June 30, 2008

Reply to Office Action Mailed: January 30, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 010408.52444US

line of Claim 12, which recites "a conductive material". Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that Claim 16 is clear and definite as well.

Claims 1, 17, 31 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as

anticipated by or, alternatively under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over, Webb

(U.S. Patent No. 3,422,213), while Claims 12, 14 and 16 have been rejected as

unpatentable over Webb in view of Pollard (U.S. Patent No. 6,034,322).

However, for the reasons set forth hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit

that all claims which remain of record in this application distinguish over the

cited references, whether considered separately or in combination.

For the sake of completeness, Applicants hereby incorporate by reference

herein the Remarks which accompanied the Amendment submitted January 16,

2008, including in particular, the materials set forth at Claims 9-11 regarding

the Webb and Pollard patents. At page 5 of the Office Action, a distinction is

drawn between the shape of the central opening (which, as noted previously, is

clearly not round, oval or polygonal in Webb) and the shape of the "marginal

area". Thus, in the carryover paragraph between pages 5 and 6, the Office

Action indicates that the metallic strip that surrounds or delimits the central

opening in Webb is round or oval.

Page 7 of 9

Amendment Dated: June 30, 2008

Reply to Office Action Mailed: January 30, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 010408.52444US

In response to this observation, Applicants respectfully submit that the

bulged portion of the connector as shown, for example in Figure 2, while having

rounded portions is clearly not round, oval or circular. Nevertheless, in order to

remove any doubt in this regard, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite that

"the compensation section and the central opening formed therein are one of

round, oval and polygonal". The latter is not true of Webb, for the reasons set

forth in the Remarks which accompanied the Amendment dated January 16,

2008. Moreover, as noted therein, in view of the disclosed method of fabrication,

it would be difficult or impossible to modify the structure of the connector strips

in Webb in order to utilize a round, oval or polygonal central opening.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 17, 31 and 32

distinguish over the Webb patent.

Moreover, for the reasons set forth in the Remarks which accompanied the

Amendment dated January 16, 2008, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims

12, 14, and 16 distinguish over the cited combination of Webb and Pollard. In

addition, Claims 12, 14 and 16 also depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 1,

and are therefore allowable for the reasons noted previously.

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application should be in

consideration for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully

requested. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the

Page 8 of 9

Amendment Dated: June 30, 2008

Reply to Office Action Mailed: January 30, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 010408.52444US

application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated

since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as

a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit

Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #010408.52444US).

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING LLP

**Intellectual Property Group** 

P.O. Box 14300

Washington, DC 20044-4300

Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500

Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

GRE:kms

6019920\_1